

The Review.


FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI.

ST. LOUIS, MO., JANUARY 7, 1904.

No. 1.

CATHOLIC YOUTH AND NON-CATHOLIC COLLEGES.

N reply to an enquiry touching the attendance of young Catholic women at Cornell University (Ithaca, N. Y.) in the Diocese of Rochester, Rt. Rev. Bishop McQuaid has answered as follows (we quote from N. Y. *Sun*, Dec. 5th):

"The Bishop of Rochester begs to say to the editor of the *Outlook*, in answer to his letter of the 23d that :

"No Catholic young lady can become a pupil of any college in which the teaching in philosophy, psychology or history is such as is universally taught in non-Catholic colleges and universities ; that attendance at chapel exercises, as is customary in such institutions on one pretext or another, is forbidden by the Catholic Church ; that co-education for young ladies at the age of those frequenting these houses of learning is perilous, and therefore to be avoided.

"In the judgment of the Bishop of Rochester, a young lady needlessly exposing her religious faith to danger, sins ; sins unrepented of can not be absolved in the tribunal of penance.

"For a second reason, the Bishop wishes to remark that, in these days of doubting and calling in question almost everything appertaining to the Christian revelation and Christian belief, it is the conscientious duty of a Catholic lady, seeking a college education, to frequent a Catholic college, in which her faith will be sedulously safeguarded by adequate instruction in philosophy, religion, and history.

"There are such Catholic colleges of high grade in the Eastern and Western section of the United States, in which are found Catholic ladies still loyal to their Church and ambitious to attain to the highest ideals of pure, cultured, and noble womanhood."

The system of co-education of the sexes attempted in some of

our American colleges can hardly be said to have met with success. While in some, even of the older universities, women are admitted equally with men to the lecture room of the schools of law and medicine—with what propriety may be questioned—the tendency is to the establishment of separate colleges for women; Radcliffe and Wellesley in Massachusetts, Bryn Mawr in Pennsylvania, Barnard and Vassar in New York: are examples of the attempt to establish a curriculum of academic studies for women corresponding with those which have been set for the young men of Yale, Harvard, Columbia, and other universities. These are but a few instances of the spread of the women's college movement.

The Catholic Church has never countenanced co-education, as that term is commonly understood; for, apart from the drawbacks inherent in the system from a merely educational point of view, the Church values the graces of Christian womanhood too highly to permit that her children should be exposed to the danger resulting from the association of youngmen and women in one class-room.

The Church has, therefore, prudently established separate colleges for the training of young men, while convent schools and academies for girls under the care of the teaching orders of religious women afford opportunity for intellectual training adequate for the education of the average Catholic young woman, at the same time that they safeguard the faith and morals of their pupils.

And if some of these, thirsting for a more particular knowledge of the subjects embraced within the so-called "higher education," propose to occupy themselves with the study of psychology, biology, history, philosophically considered, or any other of the sciences which may be ranked as part of a philosophical system, it is surely of the highest importance that they should drink from the fountain-head of true Christian, that is, Catholic philosophy. It goes without saying that this is not to be found in any non-Catholic institution of learning. Doubtless many such institutions with their enormous endowments excel in the completeness of their equipment for the study of the natural sciences. This enables them to attract numerous students, whose aim is to acquire that sort of learning which simply makes for material progress. And, while the natural sciences are the least important part of Christian philosophy, it happens, unfortunately, they are too often presented to the youthful mind and accepted as the sum of all that is valuable in human learning. Nature and her phenomena are studied without reference to any first cause; the student is not taught to "look through nature up to nature's God," and divine

revelation is either wholly rejected or is admitted only so far as it appears to corroborate the speculations of the scientists.

Instead of the Mosaic account of the creation of man to the image and likeness of God, endowed with various gifts in the order of both nature and grace, we have the evolution of man out of nebulous matter. This is effected by a creative energy which the chief apostle of modern agnosticism, the late Herbert Spencer, terms "the unknowable," and of which he tells us we can know nothing. Proceeding from this false account of the genesis of the human race, man is still further evolved so as to be capable of various emotions and of reasoning; his conduct individually and collectively is observed and the results classified and noted, and from thence his moral and social relations are determined without any reference to the supernatural, and not only without acknowledgment, but in direct challenge of those fundamental truths of Christianity which are the Alpha and Omega of all true science. Moreover, this vicious system of philosophy is presented in such alluring form, the inductions especially in the field of sociology are worked out with such skill and adroitness, that the impressionable mind of the student is captivated, his sympathies are attracted, and he fails to realize how false the basis is upon which the system is constructed or how destructive of Christian faith it is and is intended to be.

Again, history is treated simply as the record of blind fate or chance in which the hand of God is not discernible. The ways of Divine Providence as illustrated to the Catholic mind in the conduct of nations and the manifestations of His retributive justice, teach no lesson, convey no warning to the student whose historical studies are made under non-Catholic or perhaps anti-Catholic teachers.

In like manner, any serious study of metaphysics, which we think (*pace* "the devout female sex") very few Catholic women can need or will use, can not be made with safety except from Catholic text-books and under Catholic professors; and the absence of both these indispensable conditions may be safely assumed in all except Catholic colleges.

The attitude of our modern scientists toward the Church has not changed from the time when (1861) Cardinal Wiseman, speaking before the "Academia of the Catholic Religion," established in London, said: "The science of our days comes forward, not only disclaiming co-operation, sympathy or good wishes from the Church or from religion, but as a rival, an adversary, an antagonist. It advances defiant, and rampant, and menacing; too often with a sarcasm on its lips, nay, with blasphemies, scoffs, and lies upon its tongue. It 'speaks great things' and treats with levity

and contempt of what we deem most holy. And because we do not run forward and meet half-way, and embrace and receive a Judas kiss from this declared foe, the Catholic is taunted as afraid of science, as a lover of darkness, as a foe to progress."

In one of his addresses before the same Academia, Cardinal Manning said :

"They (Catholics) abhor—and I accuse myself of being a ring-leader in this abhorrence—the science now in fashion, which I take leave to call, 'the brutal philosophy,' to-wit,—there is no God, and the ape is our Adam."

And in one of his lectures on the endowments of man, the learned Bishop Ullathorne ridicules "the number, the extravagance, and the contradictory character of the theories of human nature which have been put forth in this unbelieving age by men who profess to make the nature and history of man their special study." He enumerates fifteen different theories of man's origin and character, emanating from as many different schools of "philosophers,"—pantheists, materialists, agnostics or what not—"who refuse to have God in their knowledge." And he adds, "If these monstrosities of the mind strike sensible men with astonishment, they may also teach us the great lesson that we stand as much in need of the virtue of humility to keep us reasonable and safe in our common sense as to keep us in faith with God."

With great propriety, therefore, does the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Rochester warn young women ambitious of acquiring a higher education, against choosing for this purpose a non-Catholic college, where their minds may become imbued with these scientific heresies. Nothing so surely tends to weaken the faith and to wither the spiritual life of the Catholic, man or woman, even apart from the question of false teaching, as an existence spent in a non-Catholic atmosphere, destitute of all the helps which Catholic companionship, sympathy, and example afford. What wonder if the Catholic soul, self-exiled from its own harbor of safety within the Church, becomes a derelict upon the sea of doubt, to be finally wrecked on the rocks of religious indifference or positive unbelief.

Happily, we believe, the number of young women resorting for the study of philosophy to non-Catholic colleges is comparatively small. Far more numerous are the young men, by profession Catholic, who attend non-Catholic institutions. Indeed, we are told that at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and perhaps other universities, the Catholic students are numerous enough to have formed themselves into clubs. Some of these Catholic students (we speak from personal knowledge) are the children of mixed marriages, and the attendance of the son at a non-Catholic school proves that the controlling influence in the matter of his education has not

been on the side of the Catholic parent; others again are the scions of families who delude themselves with the thought that the Catholic college is, from a social point of view, not good enough for their children, and that attendance at one of the Protestant colleges will bring them into association with the sons of eminently rich fathers, thereby ensuring social advantage (wholly among non-Catholics) and possibly some benefit in a business way in after life. Still others are there who have been ill-instructed in their religion and are in actual ignorance of the danger to which their Catholic faith is exposed.

The Church has a right to complain of the disloyalty of those laymen who, better instructed and enjoying some prominence as well as influence among their fellows, choose to send their sons and daughters to colleges where the teaching is non-Catholic and the whole atmosphere irreligious. Not only do they thereby discredit their own Church and its institutions of learning, but they recklessly endanger the souls for whom they are directly responsible to Almighty God, while their example leads other souls into the same danger. Well might these foolish parents ponder those words of the Imitation (cap. 3): "*Quam multi per-eunt per vanam scientiam in saeculo, qui parum curant de Dei servitio. Et quia magis eligunt magni esse quam humiles, ideo evanescunt in cogitationibus suis.*" How many perish in the world through vain learning who take little care of the service of God! And because they choose rather to be great than to be humble, therefore they are lost in their own vain imaginings.



WANTED—A situation as chaplain, assistant, or substitute by a priest in good standing. Apply at this office.

MINOR TOPICS.

A Last Word in a "Lost" Cause.—The writer of the editorial on the Study of Greek in the *Columbian Record* has found it proper to reply to my answer in the *THE REVIEW*. He says:

"A critic who uses the initials O. S. comments in the *St. Louis REVIEW* on a recent editorial of ours concerning the study of Greek. He makes two points. The first of these is that in a hasty way we spoke of the Latin author Livy as of a Greek. Now over this he makes a fanfare. Now a critic who exacts perfection even in trivial details (sic!) should himself be perfect."

Then the writer of the editorial goes on to explain that speaking of "the bishop that stands at the head of a diocese" as a classical scholar and enthusiastic advocate of the classical languages, I have in mind the Bishop of the Diocese of Columbus. Now, apart from the fact that his argument is entirely irrelevant to the question at issue, I was as far from applying these words to the Bishop of the Diocese of Columbus, that see being vacant, as Livy is from being a Greek. If I had intended to speak of the Diocese of Columbus, I would have used the words: "A Catholic paper which is the official organ of a diocese"; but I wrote, "which is considered the official organ of a diocese," meaning not the *Catholic Columbian* of Columbus, O., but its side-edition, the *Columbian Record* of Indianapolis, and speaking therefore of the Diocese of Indianapolis. In doing so I was justified by the following reasons:

1. Official documents pertaining to the Diocese of Indianapolis are published in the *Columbian Record* exclusively.

2. Priests of the Diocese of Indianapolis still speak of the *Columbian Record*, the successor of the old *Record*, as the diocesan paper.

3. Most of the news items in the *Columbian Record* have reference to the parishes of this Diocese.

4. In its title page we read: "*Catholic Columbian Record*, Indianapolis, Ind."*)

Consequently I have nothing to retract. Now let the writer of the editorial say what justifies him in making Livy a Greek. "*Hic Rhodus, hic salta.*"

I am very grateful to the writer of the editorial for his self-accusation that he is "hasty." This explains his false imputation referred to above. He is "hasty" also when he refers to my statement that over 60% of our great men are classical students. Without any premises he ventures the gratuitous assertion that they had been "probably" more successful without the study of Greek. It is really ridiculous, almost childish, how that gentleman proceeds. In the first sentence he makes the assertion: "It," i. e., the study of Greek, "was a dead waste of time," and in the second sentence this assertion is reduced to a mere probability: "they would have probably been more successful without it."

"Dead traditions of education," he continues, "must give way to

*) Note by the editor of *THE REVIEW*. I was the inadvertent cause of this misunderstanding, having changed the name *Columbian Record* into the better known *Catholic Columbian* in my correspondent's note, knowing that both papers are issued by the same publisher, with practically the same contents, and overlooking the circumstance that it contained a reference to the scholarly Bishop of Indianapolis.—A. P.

the living needs of the age." Let the writer of these lines compare his words with what the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore has to say in Tit. V., No. 176, and the Third in the article "Seminaria Puerorum," No. 147. At both councils the great dignitaries of the Catholic Church in the U. S. assembled and surely they were the then highest authority in questions of Catholic education in this country. They emphatically insisted on the study of the classic languages; and yet the writer of that editorial has the hardihood to declare that "Greek must go." Truly, "hasty." Let him read what Cardinal Newman has to say in his 'Idea of a University' or Hettinger in his 'Timotheus,' and then let him repeat if he dare: "Greek must go."

"There is nothing in the study of mythology or declensions," he proceeds, "essential for the development of Christian character or ideal culture." I refrain from absolutely seconding that assertion. But is the writer so ignorant as not to know of the wealth of Greek literature, both profane and sacred? Let him read the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII., "Providentissimus Deus," and take to heart what that great Pope says on the value of the sacred literature of the Greek Fathers.—O. S.

Catholic Dignitaries as Contributors to the Secular Press.—What reason can you give for the strange fact that three prominent Catholic prelates contributed to the jubilee edition of the sensational *Post-Dispatch*? I can not believe that money considerations were at the bottom.—A Reader in Illinois.

A clerical contributor answers this query thus:

"Supposing 'Reader' is correct in believing that money is not the *causa movens* of these prelates in writing for sensational secular newspapers, we may assign as a cause on the part of these papers their desire to reflect their environment. Hence, dirt and drivel, clairvoyancy and fortune-telling appear at the side of industry and politics, science and religion.

"One motive on the part of these prelates may perhaps be indicated by this passage from St. John Chrysostom (Hom. 13 ad Populum): '*Vis laudari? Lauda alium. Vis amari? Ama. Vis partibus primis potiri? Cede illas prius alteri.*' All of which may be rendered by a familiar American phrase: 'Tickle me, and I'll tickle thee.'"

It is more charitable and probably truer to assume that Catholic prelates sometimes honor the request of a widely-circulated and influential secular newspaper for a contribution, even when unaccompanied by a check, for reasons of policy. They wish to have the good will of the editors, so that they can command their columns on occasions when they may desire to speak to the great newspaper-reading public in the interests of religion.

In how far this motive may be justifiable or prudent, and to what extent these prelates accomplish their purpose, we do not now purpose to examine. We wish to add only one remark:

Catholic newspapers, as a rule, can not afford to pay liberally for special contributions, and it is a fact which we can not but deplore, that, when the average "prominent prelate" is requested to contribute to a Catholic journal whose editor is unable to enclose a check with his request, either no reply is vouchsafed or a curt answer comes from the private secretary or some other subordi-

nate officer. An example in point: The *Pittsburg Observer* prepared for its Christmas number (No. 29) a "symposium" after the fashion of the secular newspapers, on the question: "If Christ were born to-day, what would be his message to the world?" This is the reply the editor got from the Cardinal-Archbishop of Baltimore, whose name so frequently appears under more lengthy contributions to certain "yellow" papers, such as the *New York World and Journal*:

"Chancery Office,
480 N. Charles Street, Baltimore.

To the Editor of the *Pittsburg Observer*. Dear Sir: His Eminence directs me to say, in reply to your query, that Our Divine Saviour's message would be the same as it was before.

Very truly yours,

P. C. Gavan, Chancellor."

End of the "Catholic Controversy" in the New York Sun.—We (vol. x, p. 736) approvingly quoted the *Hartford Catholic Transcript* some weeks ago as saying of the so-called "Catholic controversy" going on in the *New York Sun*, that it was "more salacious than edifying," and that "it will be hard to persuade the saner portion of the Catholic public that the proper place to weep over, exaggerate, parade, and ridicule our faults, is to be found in the columns of a more or less hostile journal."

In the *Sun* of December 27th, the editor has brought the controversy "to a close" with a résumé of his own in the shape of a leading editorial under the title: "Religious Controversy and Religious Enquiry." He deplores that, "unhappily, it has aroused much ill feeling" and has allowed "the *odium theologicum*, which has made religious discussion so often injurious to the cause of religion," to again expose "its ugly front." He finds that "the tendency of thought represented" by the priest who began the discussion anonymously, and by his sympathizers, "is, in many respects, the most remarkable which has appeared in the religious world since the advent of Christianity." In truth, it is as old as Christianity. It is the spirit of Liberalism, the mother of heresy; the spirit which, as the editor rightly says, leads to "infidelity." "Where else," he asks, "can those theological students land who teach or are taught that the miracles on which rests the supernaturalism of Christianity are only myths and legends expressive of the blind search of humanity in all ages to find the key of the mystery of existence?"

In conclusion, the editor gloatingly declares that, though the disputation must end in the *Sun*, "it can and inevitably it will, go on, with consequences which may prove revolutionary in the religious world," because "it is irrepressible in the domain of thought."

From all of which the reader can easily see that this "disputation" has resulted in scandal to Catholics and in great rejoicing among our enemies. How the former can be repaired, we know not; but the attention of our enemies ought to be called to the fact that, in the words of the great Joseph von Görres, "In the Catholic Church all error lies on the surface; its roots are in the personality of him who first harbors it, and it seeks to penetrate into the doctrinal system of the Church, by which it is repulsed and

eliminated as soon as the contradiction appears; as for the author of it, if he persists in his error, he will find himself cut off from her living communion, and his ways cease to be hers. It is otherwise with Protestantism, which, as it grants sovereign power in religious matters to the individual, is compelled to permit the largest possible exercise of this power, and finds itself unable to disavow new errors and heresies, but must gather them one and all under its protecting wings." (Quoted by Janssen, 'An meine Kritiker, ii, 196.)

Pius X. is Going to Undertake the Reform of Church Music. So we are assured by several Rome correspondents. "Vox Urbis," of the N. Y. *Freeman's Journal* (No. 3678), for instance, writes: "The Holy Father is about to begin a series of instructions on the subject which will leave no doubt as to what his mind is on the subject. The summary of these directions may be set down as follows: All theatrical music must be absolutely banished from the house of God. In many places the music, which is 'performed' during mass and benediction, is a source of distraction rather than of edification for the faithful—and Rome itself is particularly the victim of this evil. The Plain Chant is to be used as far as possible. No other music so fully expresses the mind and feeling of the Church. . . . The Holy Father makes no secret of his predilection for the method of Solesmes, so-called because its revival has been due to the studies and publications of the Benedictine monks in Solesmes in France. When music other than the Plain Chant is employed, it must be distinctly religious in character and calculated to inspire piety in the faithful. The practice of congregational singing is to be encouraged by all means. In the ancient Church all present at religious services joined in the chant and in the responses. If modern congregations were stimulated to do the same, it would prove an additional incentive to them to be more regular in their attendance at religious functions."

The correspondent adds:

"The custom which prevails in some parts of England and the United States of employing non-Catholics or notoriously irreligious persons as 'star performers' at high mass or vespers is worthy of condemnation." Whether he simply speaks his own mind in this latter paragraph or whether we may expect an official papal condemnation of this abuse also, remains a theme for speculation.

THE REVIEW, which has stood almost alone these ten years among the English Catholic periodicals of America, in its strenuous advocacy of the reform of Church music, for which it has even, on various occasions, been made to suffer abuse, heartily rejoices at the prospect held forth by "Vox Urbis" and other reliable Rome correspondents, and hopes the Holy Father will not only approve and confirm the salutary regulations already existing on the subject, but will find means to *enforce* them.*)

Since we wrote the above, the cable has reported the publication of an official note on the reform of Church music in the Vatican *Osservatore Romano*. The text is not yet before us.

*) We can hardly believe, however, that the Holy Father will insist on the universal introduction of the Solesmes style of plain chant, because, as the *Semaine Religieuse* of Paris recently (28, Nov.) said: "The plain chant of Solesmes requires artists for its successful performance; and artists" (especially in our American church choirs) "are rare."

Is the Archbishop of Baltimore Primate of the Church in the United States?—This question has lately again been ventilated in the Catholic press. "W. A. R." (whoever he may be) writes from Baltimore to the *Catholic Union and Times* (Dec. 10th):

"Last week, in answer to the question of the *Milwaukee Citizen*, who is the Primate of the Church in the United States? you seem to imply that the primacy of honor attaching to the Archdiocese of Baltimore, is due solely to the fact that her archbishops have presided over all our national councils. This is not correct. A decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, 1858, and approved by Pius IX. declares that in all councils and meetings of whatsoever kind, the Archbishop of Baltimore shall have precedence over all other archbishops, regardless of the period of their promotion or ordination. Reference to the decrees of the Council will show this."

Will W. A. R. not please tell us where we can find the text of that alleged decree of the Propaganda?

If such a decree exists, why did Leo XIII. say in his "Apostolic Letter" to Archbishop Gibbons of Baltimore, dated January 4th, 1884, that he appointed him Apostolic Delegate to convoke and preside over the Third Plenary Council, because His Eminence Cardinal McCloskey of New York was prevented to assume these duties by ill health? ("...quum Venerabilis Frater Noster Joannes S. R. E. Presbyter Cardinalis McCloskey, ex dispensatione Apostolica, Archiepiscopus Neo-Eboracensis, adversa detineatur valetudine, Tibi.....praefatum indicendi convocandique Concilium, eique praesidendi munus...delegamus." Acta at Decreta Conc. Plen. Balt. III., pp. xix-xx.) And why did not Pius IX. himself, in his letter to Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore, appointing him Apostolic Delegate for the Second Plenary Council, refer to this decree of 1858, instead of simply saying: "...in eam sententiam venimus, ut Tibi, Venerabilis Frater, cujus pietas, doctrina, et summa erga Sedem Apostolicam observantia apprime nobis comperta est, Concilium istud convocandi, eique praesidendi officium delegaremus"? (Coll. Lacens., iii, col. 326.)

That all three of our plenary councils were convoked and presided over by archbishops of Baltimore, is clearly not due to any right or privilege, but purely to accidental circumstances: and if the Archbishop of Baltimore is Primate of the Catholic Church in the United States in any canonical sense of the term, the Catholic public is not aware of the fact.

The Failure of Governor Taft and of Our Administration in the Philippines.—Governor Taft's departure from Manila has been made the text, in many American newspapers, of unqualified praise of his "splendid achievements" in the Philippines, and his arrival in Washington, where he is to assume the Secretaryship of War, will probably call forth still stronger outbursts of eulogy and admiration. It is interesting to note that neither the Filipinos nor the Americans resident in those islands, are joining in these paeans, but that some of them, on the contrary, are giving vent to very pronounced criticism of the man and his methods. We shall not quote Catholic sources, because they are supposed to be prejudiced against Mr. Taft and everything American. But here is the *Manila Review of Trade*, which says, among other things

equally uncomplimentary (Vol. iii, No. 3), in an editorial article on "Taft's Failure and Consequent Retirement," that the retiring Governor "almost from the beginning," "lost the confidence and esteem of the Americans and foreigners resident in the Philippines, and now retires from the Islands without the confidence and esteem even of the native people." The "source of the Governor's failure" is ascribed to his "constant misrepresentation of conditions" in the Islands. His 1900 report to the President is branded as "false in practically every statement." The *Review of Trade* speaks, of course, primarily, if not solely, from the commercial, material point of view. On the religious side, as our readers know, the Governor's failure has been still more ignominious. He has fomented the Aglipay schism and forced the religious orders to sell their property at a figure far below its real value; and it is not due to his good will if the "friars" have not been compelled by brute force to withdraw from the Islands altogether.

The *Manila Trade Review* believes that "speedy relief can be looked for under the new order of things." We sincerely hope that this "relief" will not be confined solely to the commercial situation.

It is interesting also to note the *Trade Review's* statement that "99 Filipinos in every 100" "prefer the Spaniards to the Americans." Such "a practically unanimous sentiment" must indeed "have some good and sufficient reason back of it," and the Manila paper is probably not far from the truth when it frankly attributes it "to the fact that our administration" of the Philippines "has been of no benefit whatever to the Filipino people."

Catholic Literary Criticism.—An esteemed subscriber of ours writes: The number of educated Catholics in the world to-day must be very insignificant who do not know that the Catholics of Prussia stand in the foremost rank of Catholic thought and action. Those who have seen and observed the development of things in Prussia since 1860, know that in a great measure the success of the Catholic Centre Party is due to the truthful and frank criticisms in the Catholic press. A Catholic priest or layman who can not write an article, pamphlet, or book, able to withstand the severest criticism, should be relegated to the background. It is very humiliating to educated Catholics to see men claiming leadership in Catholic thought, ignorant of what they ought to know; and worse yet, if they get angry when their ignorance is shown up.

If the writer in the pretended Catholic magazine *Men and Women of Cincinnati* did not know the work of Ed. Richard, he ought to have known at least the article in the *Catholic World* or *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, written some years ago, showing clearly that Parkman was guilty of flagrant suppression of the truth. If a man who poses as a historian, and by every possible means is presented as such to the public, is publicly convicted of dishonesty, a Catholic magazine ought not to recommend him to Catholics. Pope Leo XIII. gives it as one of the characteristics of a true historian not to suppress the truth. If Parkman be cleared of that accusation in regard to the Acadians, I am willing to make the most ample apology.

The old German saw has it: "Wer einmal lügt, dem glaubt man

nicht, und wenn er auch die Wahrheit spricht," i. e., a liar is never believed, though he may speak the truth.

Go on, Mr. Editor, and speak the truth, whether it be pleasant or not. Make every Catholic writer dread to get between your scissors and you deserve well of the future. And let it be known and proved that every book or paper having the approbation of THE REVIEW can be safely put in every Catholic home or library. With Archbishop Ireland we say: "The highest and best ought not to be too high and too good for us." Let Catholic writers who can not stand the severest criticism, not wait till next ground-hog day, but creep into a hole and pull the hole in after them.—REV. A. DEMMING, Carlyle, Ill.

Some Non-Catholic Estimates of Bulwer-Lytton.—An esteemed contributor of THE REVIEW writes us:

In case you desire to retort any further in re Bulwer-Lytton, I send you herewith three quotations from non-Catholic sources. If the adversary will not be content with Catholic opinion, he may take his choice of Macaulay's or Allison's estimates of Lytton.

These estimates are as follows:

By Lord Macaulay: "I think of Bulwer, still, as I have always thought. He has considerable talent and eloquence; but he is fond of writing about what he only half understands, or understands not at all. His taste is bad, and bad from a cause which lies deep and is not to be removed—from want of soundness, manliness, and simplicity of mind." [Quoted from Trevelyan's 'Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay,' Vol. II., p. 43. Harper & Bros., New York.]

And in speaking of 'The Last Days of Pompeii,' he says:

"The Christianity of Bulwer's book is not to my taste." (Id. p. 44.)

The historian Allison, reviewing Bulwer's work and character, says: "His novels in profound knowledge, brilliancy of description, pathos of incident, and eloquence of language are second to none in the English language. The great defects of his writings in a political point of view are the total absence of any reference to a superintending power and the moral government of the world; and the continual and labored effort to exculpate the errors and screen the vices and draw a veil over the perils of democratic government." [Quoted from Modern British Essayists, Vol. II., p. 230. Carey and Hart, Phila., 1846.]

Extract from 'Noctes Ambrosianae' [by John Wilson, "Christopher North" of *Blackwood's Magazine*] Vol. V. p. 371:

"As for Mr. Bulwer, laying the most hackneyed commonplaces out of view, the majestic features, elegant mien, intense loves, and indomitable nerves which his heroes share with ten thousand Belvilles and Delvilles—these air-drawn personages are nothing, if not cox-combical. Who can think, with common patience, of his endless chatter about their tapering fingers, their 'feet small to a fault,' their velvet robes-de-chambre, and the violet damask curtains of their dressing-rooms?"

We may add that Bulwer's 'Ernest Maltravers,' which the *Pittsburg Observer* (No. 27) recommended to its Catholic readers as "inculcating moral lessons of a high order," was, in 1901, placed on the "index of prohibited books" (books "that are believed to have a bad influence of some sort or another," and "for this rea-

son are denied to certain classes of library patrons") of the St. Louis Public Library, and that a secular daily, the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, of Oct. 27th, 1901, justified this measure by characterizing both 'Ernest Maltravers' and 'Alice' as "immoral in tone."

We repeat, for the benefit of the *Catholic Journal* of Memphis, the *Pittsburg Catholic*, et id genus omne: Are we to be less discriminating in our literary and moral standards than Protestants?

A Priestly Protest Against Euchres and Socials.—Rev. Daniel J. O'Shea, in a letter to a Pittsburg paper, which we find reproduced in the *Catholic Telegraph* (No. 50), unmercifully scores Catholic euchres and socials, and, incidentally, the Knights of Columbus.

"There may be and doubtless are instances," he says, "when an appeal for assistance to the public is necessary and justifiable, but have we Catholics nothing better to offer to the public than a public exhibition of hugging, or a deck of cards, or even chicken salad and turkey? If it is a question of revenue, would it not be better to educate our people to contribute directly to the support of the Church, and give them to understand that contributing to the Church a fair proportion of their income is not a charity or a matter of commercial exchange? Until this is done the Church will continue to stand before the public in the attitude of a beggar, and her real mission and work will be impeded. We shall never impress Catholicity upon the public mind by 'receptions' or 'tea parties,' no matter how successful, 'socially and financially,' they may be.

"In this connection it might be pertinent to ask, What are our Catholic societies doing? This is a practical and important question. Every society has, or at least should have, an object, and yet of most of them we never hear anything unless it be an annual meeting for the election of officers, or to 'whereas' and 'resolve' on the death of a member. Some of our societies were organized principally for beneficial purposes; others, like the Knights of Columbus, for example, were founded for a higher purpose. What are they doing to prove their usefulness? From societies enjoying episcopal approbation we have a right to demand more than constitutions and by-laws and pledges. We want results. Religious societies, like political parties, sometimes expend all their energy in making promises and formulating programs and platforms. It seems to me that if some of our Catholic societies did not run so much to banquets and lodges and parades, and would do a little more for the spiritual, mental, and material improvement of their members, they would serve a more useful purpose and would give more tangible evidence for their right to exist."

Who "Beheaded the Hydra" of "Americanism"?—We read in the *Western Watchman* of Dec. 20th, 1903: "Spadoni, the editor of the short-lived *True Catholic American*, published in Rome for a time, has sued the General of the Jesuits for compensation for his services in overthrowing the gigantic conspiracy discovered a few years ago to Americanize the Catholic Church. If the man delivered the goods he should be paid; and if his claim is just he should be munificently rewarded. But we fear there will be a rush of claimants. Mgr. Schroeder laid claim to the honor of

having beheaded the hydra. Another ex-professor of our Catholic University thought he had something to do with the execution of the monster. Then Father Manien is sure he killed Cock Robin. Lastly our own young warrior, Preuss, the comilito of the first named, should not have his claims ignored. Is there any time specified by the Italian courts for the filing of claims."

Few of our readers, if any, have ever heard of Spadoni. His alleged suit against the General of the Jesuits, if not a fiction of the newspaper correspondents, is a plain attempt at blackmail. Only one number of the *True Catholic American* ever appeared, and its contents and tone were such that the latest historian of 'Americanism,' M. l'Abbé Albert Houtin, (not an "ultra-Conservative" by any means) suggests that Spadoni was hired by the Liberals to discredit their opponents.

As for the man who "beheaded the hydra" of "Americanism," he was neither Msgr. Schröder (God rest his noble soul!), nor Dr. Pohle, nor Dr. Périès, nor Dr. Maignen (we suppose he is meant by "Father Manien"), nor least of all ye humble scribe of ye REVIEW: but His late Holiness, Pope Leo XIII; and the sword with which he performed the salutary if painful operation was the famous Brief "Testem benevolentiae," which we would recommend to our reverend confrère of the *Western Watchman* as an appropriate text for his daily meditation throughout the blithe new year.

— Pius X. has announced that he will continue the policy, adopted by his lamented predecessor twenty years ago, of giving free access to the savants of all nations, to the literary treasures of the Vatican. Dr. Pastor, the Director of the Austrian Historical Institute in Rome, in a recent audience with the Pontiff, when presenting to him the fourth volume of his monumental 'History of the Popes From the Close of the Middle Ages,' gave expression to the hope that the liberal policy of Leo XIII. would be continued. The Pope in strong terms declared such to be his intention, and closed with the words: "Non è da temere la verità," We have nothing to fear from the truth.

— A subscriber thinks the late public school scandal at Sullivan, Ind., ought to find mention in THE REVIEW, which, as the Abbé Houtin's newest book on 'Americanism' again shows, is preserved and studied in many a library, foreign as well as domestic, as a reliable "source" of contemporary American "Culturgeschichte." Our friend evidently considers the Sullivan occurrence symptomatic, and it is indeed not likely to occur in any but a godless secular school. The story is thus briefly told in a despatch to the *Chicago Tribune* of Dec. 22nd:

"Miss Erline Sinclair has filed suit for \$10,000 damages against Floyd Deckard, Anna Deckard, Gertrude McClelland, Pearl Parks, and Kate Parks. She complains that the defendants assaulted and overpowered her, bound her hands together with ropes, lashed her to a rail, and placed her in an icy pond. Miss Sinclair is the school teacher who promised her pupils a 'treat.' Her refusal to tell them what the 'treat' would be caused the assault."

